DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 245 EA 014 077

AUTHOR West, Phillip T.
TITLE An Analysis of Public Relations Policy Development in Selected Public School Districts.
PUB DATE 11 Aug 80
NOTE 49p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (34th, Norfolk, VA, August 10-15, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Board of Education Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; National Surveys; Organizational Objectives; Participation; *Policy Formation; Position Papers; *Public Relations; School Community Relationship; Values

ABSTRACT

In response to school districts' needs to improve public confidence in the schools, researchers surveyed 74 public relations directors in 147 districts in 25 states to determine the key ingredients for developing a model public relations policy. Respondents ranked 93 paired statements on both what "are" and what "ought to be" their districts' policy development processes in public relations. The statements fell into six areas, including participation in policy formation, values, goals, administrative structure, strategies, and policy assessment. Demographic and other data were also collected on the respondents and their districts. Respondents tended to be untenured staffpersons with bachelors' or masters' degrees and some experience in teaching, administration, and public relations. Their districts were mostly medium-sized and suburban with a written public relations policy. Analysis of variance on the 93 paired statements yielded 41 with significantly high rankings. Among the policy development recommendations were that educators, parents, and students should participate in determining district public relations policy; that schools and communities must have mutual trust; and that school principals should carry out their own public relations programs. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED207245

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

An Analysis of Public Relations Policy Development In Selected Public School Districts

Philip T. West
Professor, Educational Administration
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

Presented at the 34th Annual National Conference of
Professors of Educational Administration
Norfolk, Virginia
Monday, August 11, 1980

For Limited Distribution

EA 014 07?

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P.T. West
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AN ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC RELATIONS POLICY DEVELOPMENT IN SELECTED PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS

by Philip T. West
Texas A&M University

During the past five years there has been a hue and cry that the public's confidence in its schools has been on the decline. At the 1977 annual seminar of the National School Public Relations Association (NSPRA),some concern was expressed about a decline in public confidence in the public schools. In 1978 NSPRA's annual seminar was focused on building public confidence in the public schools, thereby crystallizing the growing concerns of the previous seminar. That same year NSPRA published Building Public Confidence In Your Schools.

But NSPRA was not alone in its concern. In 1979 two presidents of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) expressed similar concerns. The first presidential message was centered on improving public confidence;[1] the second, on building public confidence.[2] During that same year AASA, in fact, conducted a symposium on restoring public confidence, the result of which was to identify several major goals to resolve the confidence issue. One of these goals was a good communications program; another, a clearly written board policy to support this program.[3] Put another way, a school communication, or public relations, program was viewed as a public confidence building block while policy was seen as the cornerstone.

The importance of a clearly written public relations policy cannot be taken lightly. NSPRA, for example, includes among its Standards for Educational Public Relations Programs such a policy which, with clarity and succinctness, expresses the purposes of a program.[4] Indeed, a long range objective of NSPRA is to have 50% of all public educational institutions develop, adopt, and implement public relations policies meeting its standards by 1982.[5]

In much the same vein Bortner claims that direction, continuity, support

and even legal defense is inherent in a well-developed public relations policy.[6] Board, administrative and staff commitment to communication responsibilities is also an outgrowth of a written public relations policy.[7] To Mayer, a written public relations policy is a board pledge to finance a public relations program.[8] In developing a rationale for written policies, Faber goes even further by claiming that written policies, in and of themselves, make for better public relations.[9]

PR Policy statements cam be simple or complex. They may signify no more than board commitment or they may elaborately detail various ways and means to fulfill this commitment.[10] As written, the statements may be subject to broad and flexible interpretation, leaving much to the discretion of the chief administrator, or they may be a composite of precise rules and regulations. They may include rationale, parameters, constraints, or appear as a legal resolution.[11] They can be written to sell or inform the school's publics. They can also be written to interpret to or interact with the school's publics.[12]

The traditional legal model of policy making reflected a hierarchial communications structure, with policy decisions made at its apex by the board to the exclusion of other members of the school family, and with the superintendent carrying out these decisions.[13] Today, educational policy making has given way to a systems approach in which a variety of groups are thought to shape the goals of a system.[14] Teachers, for example, through collective bargaining, have drastically affected and curtailed board decisions, as has the civil rights movement.[15] Citizen participation, student unrest and taxpayer revolts have also done much to shape a board's policy decisions. Too, the growing technology of education and its concomitant professionalism has made boards turn more often to administrators for assistance in policy

decisions.[16]

More important even are the environmental forces - cultural, legal, political, and economic - which pervade the traditional structure of policy making to impact upon board decisions.[17] Embodied by groups, these forces manifest the dominant values of a variety of publics, all of whom, through participation in board representation or direct school affairs, shape board policy goals. These goals, though undergirded by values, may, however, represent a synthesis of group demands rather than the value of single group.[18] Nevertheless, since policy commits the future of an organization, an understanding and appreciation of a community's conflict laden values are essential to policy goal determination.[19]

Policy implementation is directly related to the philosophy it embodies.[20] Philosophy dictates and strategies act as enabling factors to achieve short or long range goals. As societal forces are altered or redirected and the citizenry of a community, along with its leadership, changes, so do the values and goals of that community. Under new leadership, which, in turn, gives way to new policies, periodic policy assessment is needed for continued public support. Kindred, Bagin, and Gallagher, in fact, view the appraisal of public relations policy as an ongoing board responsibility, which may include superintendency reports as well as advisory committee reviews.[21]

Thus policy formulation is the result of a variety of considerations ranging from who shall participate in what kind of structure to what kinds of goals shall be implemented and assessed. And public relations policy is no exception to this assumption.

Purpose of the Study

The study was predicated on the assumption that a well-developed public

relations policy would enhance school community relationships and thereby improve the public's confidence in its schools. Its purpose was to determine the ingredients of a model public relations policy which could be drafted and operationalized by public schools across the nation. Through the perceptions of school public relations directors, it was felt, selected aspects of school PR policy development and their concomitant policy statements could be weighted, ranked, and translated into meaningful policy guidelines. Further, by comparing the perceptions of these same PR directors in a series of IS and OUGHT policy statements, it was assumed that policy-making strengths and weaknesses could be identified and serve as an information base for action by boards and administrators engaged in PR policy development. While a few independent variables were also examined in relation to the policy formulation perceptions of PR directors, only one of these shall be explored here. Given the acknowledged importance of written policy in the body proper of policy literature, it was to be determined here whether having or not having a written PR policy would make a difference in the way PR directors perceived the importance of selected policy statements. The study was endorsed by the National School Public Relations Association in a letter dated March 16, 1978.

Questionnaire Design and Research Methodology

The design of the mail-out questionnaire dealt with 6 proposed elements of PR policy development: (1) participants, under which were listed 14 statements; (2) values, with 23 statements; (3) goals, with 21 statements; (4) structure, with 15 statements; (5) strategies, with 10 statements; and (6) assessment, with 10 statements.

Participants were asked to respond to two-sided statements in terms of their relevance to the development of school PR policy. On the left side of each policy statement, participants were to indicate how their school district

PR policy is presently constructed and on the right side, how it ought to be constructed. In responding to the statements, they were asked to use the following scale: 4 = always, 3 = frequently, 2 = occasionally, 1 = rarely, 0 = never.

Since part I of the instrument consisted of demographic data, the Computer Program Distribution Statistics was used to obtain frequency distributions to provide a basis for comparisons. In part II of the questionnaire, the Computer FORTRAN Program ANSCHEFF, a combination of Veldman's Anovar and Barker's Scheffe,[22] was used for analysis of variance to test selected research questions. Part III of the questionnaire, which requested PR directors to return with the questionnaire a copy of their district's school PR policy, was to serve as a basis for a future content analysis of extant PR policies. As it worked out, however, the policies submitted were, in all available cases, used to verify whether written policies were actual PR policies or merely job descriptions of PR directors.

Some of the initial policy statements on the questionnaire were an outgrowth of a written assignment given to students in an advanced class in educational public relations (EDAD 689: Special Topics in Practices and Problems in Educational Public Relations), at Texas A&M University where the Department of Educational Administration offers a public relations emphasis for students majoring in educational administration at both the master's and doctoral levels. When the preliminary questionnaire was constructed, it was administered to this same class as well as to students enrolled in a beginning course in educational public relations (EDAD 640: School-Community Relationships), required of educational public relations students and students seeking administrative certification. Questionnaire refinements were subsequently made.

The sample population was systematically determined and randomly drawn from the 1977-78 National School Public Relations Association (NSPRA) Membership Directory and Directory Update, which listed members in 46 states and the District of Columbia. With the school district serving as the unit of analysis, the sample was drawn from a total of 519 clearly identifiable school public relations directors, or their titular equivalents, employed in an equal number of school districts, or one per each school district represented in the study. The number of respondents chosen to participate in the study was 150, or better than 1 out of every 4 eligible respondents.

To validate the questionnaire a pilot study was conducted on April 14, 1978. The pilot study, which consisted of ten questionnaires, or a sample which exceeded 5% of the total sample, netted a return of 70%. The pilot study was conducted only in Texas, with those selected for participation already eliminated from the sample proper. The pilot brought about only minor revisions in the instrumentation.

The first full-fledged questionnaire mailing occurred on May 10, 1978. Identified participants were sent a cover letter introducing them to the study and eliciting their support, a questionnaire to complete, and a postage paid return evelope for their opinions. The letter cited the NSPRA study endorsement and asked that participants return their questionnaires by May 24, 1978.

The second mailing was a follow-up letter which, after stressing the importance of individual contributions to the success of the study, asked that identified participants return their responses within the next few days.

The third and last mailing took place on June 21, 1978. This mailing contained a second questionnaire and another return postage paid return envelope, along with a cover letter that requested that any or all of the questionnaire be responded to within the next two weeks so that the sampling process could be brought to a close. The processing of the data was begun in August 1978, but was not concluded until December 1979.

The final results of the study represented the opinions of 74 school public relations directors in 147 school districts in 25 states and the District of Columbia, or approximately 50% of an adjusted sample of 147. The three disqualifiers were due to an inability to respond to questionnaire items because of newness of position (1), a change of position outside the field of education (1), and the elimination of a public relations program (and presumably position) after the passage of a bond election (1). States and number of respondents in school districts therein were Arizona (2), California (6), Colorado (2), Florida (1), Georgia (2), Kansas (1), Illinois (3), Indiana (3), Maryland (1), Massachusetts (2), Michigan (9), Minnesota (3), Missouri (4), Nebraska (2), New Jersey (3), New York (2), Nevada (1), North Carolina (3), Ohio (4), Oregon (5), Pennsylvania (8), South Carolina (1), Texas (2), Wisconsin (2), and Wyoming (1).

Demographic Data Analysis

Part I of the questionnaire dealt with demographic data pertinent to study respondents and their school districts. The frequency distributions derived from data analysis were arranged under two major headings: characteristics of school districts and characteristcs of PR persons.

Characteristics of School Districts

The largest numbers of school PR directors were from school districts with student enrollments of (1) less than 6,000 (27%) and (2) 12,000 to 24,999 (35%). The smallest numbers came from school districts with enrollments of 50,000 - 99,999 (5%) and 100,000 or more (5%).

Eighty-two percent of these PR directors were from school districts with grades 1 through 12. Almost half of the districts were identified as suburban with the greatest number of school districts located in community populations of 25,000 - 49,999 (22%) and 50,000 - 99,999 (27%). While one-third of these school districts had an assessed valuation of between 100 and 300 million, 18% and 16% respectively, almost one half reported a per pupil expenditure ranging from 1,500 to 1,999 (26%) to 2,000 or over (12%).

The typical school district has a PR staff of 1, and over half (62%) of the school districts have written PR policies, with an additional 4% in the

process of writing one. (The original figure of written policies reported was somewhat higher. When cross-checked against the policies submitted, however, written policies slightly decreased in number because of their confusion with job descriptions.)

Characteristics of PR Persons

While 42% of the PR persons polled reported having a bachelor's degree, an additional 30% and 7% reported holding masters and doctorate degrees. About half reported undergraduate majors in either English (28%) or journalism (18%), with an additional 15% reporting undergraduate minors in English (7%) and journalism (8%). The biggest graduate major was in educational administration (18%), at the master's degree level and (9%) at the doctoral degree level.

While little more than one third (38%) of the respondents had been employed as a PR director in their present school for from 2 to 4 years, almost an equal number (38%) had from 5 to more than 10 years of PR experience in their present school districts. An additional 32% reported previous experience as a PR director, which ranged from less than 2 years to 8 - 10 years.

Forty-one percent of the PR directors reported experience in education as an administrator, which ranged from less than 2 (1%) to more than 10 (8%) years, while 53% reported from less than 2 (4%) to more than 10 (18%) years experience as a teacher. Fourteen percent also reported years of experience in other aspects of education, not defined in the study. Other experiences reported were in business (38%), industry (3%), government (1%), military (16%), communications: newspaper (46%); magazine (6%); radio (12%); television (3%); and other (14%), which was undefined.

The largest number of PR positions were reported as staff (51%) and

untenured (43%), with 78% of the PR directors claiming to hold membership on an administrative team. While only 27% were certified as administrators, 57% were certified as teachers.

Policy Aspects Analysis

Data analysis of the second part of the instrument consisted of 3 tests: (1) a statistical comparison between trials of IS and OUGHT selected policy statements, categorized under 6 selected aspects of policy development; (2) a statistical test to detect differences among 3 groups (those with written policies, those with unwritten policies, and those with policies being written), so as to determine their perceptions regarding the importance of these same variables; and (3) a statistical test which sought differences between only 2 groups, written and unwritten, at which time "being written" was included in the unwritten category. The latter test was prompted after some consideration had been given to the possibility that the "being written" category might imply little or no actual PR policy development and thus be tantamount more to unwritten rather than to written policy.

The results of test 1 are best viewed within the context of 2 sets of summary tables. The first set of tables, 1 through 6, summarizes and ranks by OUGHT means the IS and OUGHT means of respondents, in regard to their perceptions of selected PR policy statements. The second set of tables, 7 through 12, ranks policy statements between trials by F-ratio. At the end of each table statistical significance is reported at the .05 level by one asterisk and at the .01 level by two asterisks.

A review of Tables 1 through 6 indicates an overwhelming amount of difference between IS and OUGHT variables. With few exceptions all policy statements are either significant at the .05 or .01 confidence levels.

Table 1. - A Ranked Comparison of "Is" and "Ought" Means for PR Policy Participants statements, Rank Ordered by "Ought" Means

IS			OUGHT	
Rank	Mean	Variable	Mean	Rank
1	3.2949	PR policy is district wide.	3.7436**	1
5	2.4675	PR policy is written.	3.5584**	2
2	2.6203	PR policy is developed by the PR director and approved by the superintendent and the board.	3.1772**	3
4	2.4872	PR policy is written by the PR director.	2.7308*	4
10	0.7922	PR policy is determined by a representative committee comprised of board members, administrators, teachers, parents, students, and the public relations director.	2.5065**	5
3	2.5263	PR policy is determined by the superintendent and approved by the board.	2.4079	6
8	1.3636	PR policy is developed with input from various community groups.	2.3377**	7
11	0.5455	The board has a standing public relations committee.	1.9870**	8
6	1.6154	PR policy is determined by board members.	1.6538*	9
7	1.4103	PR policy is written by the superintendent.	1.6154*	10
13	0.4079	PR policy is developed by a citizen's advisory committee.	1.4211**	11
9	0.8421	PR policy is determined by individual building principals and approved by the superintendent and the board.	1.1447**	12
14	0.2949	PR policy is developed by outside consultants and approved by the superintendent and the board.	0.8462**	13
12	0.5065	PR policy is determined by influential members of the community and approved by the board.	0.4156	14

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 2. - A Ranked Comparison of "Is" and "Ought" Means for PR Policy Values, Statements, Rank Ordered by "Ought" Means.

IS Rank	IS Mean	Variable	OUGHT Mean	OUGHT Rank
6	3.3038	The public must have confidence in its schools.	3.9367**	1
5	3.3077	Community attitudes and expectations about their schools are important for boards and administrations to know.	3.9359**	2
1	3.5570	Schools belong to the public.	3.9241**	3
10	3.1519	Support is achieved through effective two-way communication systems between school and community.	3.8861**	4
2	3.4211	The school is an integral part of the community.	3.8816**	5
9	3.1711	Mutual trust between community and school is the foundation of any school PR program.	3.8158**	6
4	3.3733	Open board meetings promote good school-press relations.	3.7467**	7
3	3.4079	Keeping the press informed enhances school-community relations.	3.6974**	8
18	2.9189	An open school climate is conducive to effective administrative, staff, student, and parent relationships.	3.6351**	9
15	2.9869	An informed staff is a productive one.	3.5658**	10
12	3.0658	Schools promote good citizenship.	3.5658**	10
8	3.1818	Teaching excellence is the best kind of PR.	3.5195**	11
7	3.2667	Leadership is a responsibility of boards and administrators.	3.4933**	12
16	2.9863	A well developed school philosophy promotes the ideals of the community.	3.4931**	13
13	3.0548	Education is meant to meet the needs of the various publics.	3.4247**	14

Table 2. (continued)

IS Rank	IS Mean	Variable	OUGHT Mean	OUGHT Rank
11	3.1216	The school is only as strong as the various publics who support it.	3.3784**	15
20	2.6667	Citizen participation imparts direction and meaning to the school program.	3.3467**	16
14	3.0385	An uninformed public is an unsupportive one.	3.3333**	17
19	2.8289	Changes and innovations are vital to progress.	3.1842**	18
17	2.9730	The ideals of the community must be promoted.	3.1757**	19
21	2.6184	Schools must be sold to the public.	2.8421*	20
22	1.8133	Conflict promotes growth.	2.0533*	21
23	1.5867	Professional educators need no assistance in running the schools.	1.2667*	22

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 3. - A Ranked Comparison of "Is" and "Ought" Means for PR Policy Goals Statements, Rank ordered by "Ought" Means.

IS			OUGHT	
Rank	Mean	Variable	Mean	Rank
4	3.3784	To establish a two-way communication system between the school and its various publics.	3.8919**	1
1	3.6133	To develop a good working relationship with the media.	3.8533**	2
2	3.5600	To disseminate information to the school's publics.	3.8400**	3
5	3.3514	To eliminate rumor and misunderstanding.	3.8243**	4
3	3.5000	To disseminate information to certificated and noncertificated personnel.	3.8243**	4
8	3.0986	To interpret the school's curriculum to its various publics.	3.7042**	5
7	3.3067	To report student achievement.	3.6933**	6
6	3.3108	To interpret board and administrative action.	3.6892**	7
9	2.9861	To improve communication between parents and teachers.	3.5139**	8
10	2.9296	To interpret the school budget to the school's various publics.	3.5070**	9
15	2.5000	To survey community attitudes and expectations about the schools to guide board and administrative action.	3.4730**	10
19	1.9296	To provide PR inservice for administrators.	3.3944**	11
8	2.8592	To interpret the school's extra-curricular program to its various publics.	3.3803**	12
11	2.8784	To encourage citizen participation at board meetings.	3.3649**	13

Table 3. (continued)

IS Rank	IS Mean	Variable	OUGHT Mean	OUGHT Rank
14	2.5211	To develop face to face communication systems.	3.2958**	14
20	1.7887	To provide PR inservice for teachers.	3.1831**	15
21	1.6338	To provide PR inservice for board members.	3.1690**	16
13	2.5342	To develop citizen's advisory committees.	3.1370**	17
17	2.1507	To encourage faculty participation in community affairs.	2.9726**	18
16	2.4286	To encourage professional development through formal study and workshops.	2.9571**	19
18	1.9718	To encourage active participation in local, state, and national educational conferences.	2.6479**	20

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 4. - A Ranked Comparison of "Is" and "ought" Means for PR Policy Structure Statements, Rank Ordered by Ought Means.

IS Rank	IS Mean	Variable	OUGHT Mean	OUGHT Rank
1	3.6111	The PR director reports directly to the superintendent.	3.9167**	1
2	3.0423	The school's public relations activities are carried out by both the central office and individual schools.	3.5070**	2
7	1.9014	The role of the PR director is defined by policy.	3.2535**	3
4	2.7714	The PR policy is written in broad policy language.	3.2143*	4
3	2.8857	The PR policy is developed to provide the superintendent with considerable discretion in determining how it is interpreted and implemented.	3.0714	5
8	1.7536	The PR policy is a statement of school philosophy.	2.9420**	6
12	1.2941	The PR policy defines PR roles of board members, administrators, teachers, and other school personnel.	2.6912**	7
10	1.3692	The PR policy is a series of goal statements.	2.6769**	8
5	2.4507	School principals are responsible for carrying out their own PR programs.	2.4930	9
11	1.3099	PR policy is meticulously developed with plans and procedures spelled out.	2.3803**	10
9	1.6705	PR policy is developed from a study of other school district PR policies.	2.1324**	11
6	1.9155	Public relations activities are conducted only by central office personnel.	1.5493**	12
13	0.5821	PR policy is written as behavioral objectives.	1.1642**	13
15	0.4603	PR policy is written in the form of a legal resolution.	0.8730**	14

Table 4. (continued)

IS Rank	IS Mean	Variable	OUGHT Mean	OUGHT Rank
14	0.5588	PR policy is developed from a study of board minutes.	0.8235**	15

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 5. - A Ranked Comparison of "Is" and "Ought" Means for PR Policy Strategies Statements, Rank Ordered by "Ought" Means

IS Rank	IS Mean	Variable	OUGHT Mean	OUGHT Rank
2	2.7324	PR strategies are determined and implemented by the PR director.	2.9155*	1
1	2.7571	PR strategies are developed by the PR director and approved for implementation by the superintendent.	2.8857*	2
3	2.4930	PR strategies are determined by the PR director with implementation subject to the approval of the superintendent and the board.	2.7183*	3
5	1.9155	PR strategies are jointly determined and implemented by central office personnel and principals in individual schools.	2.5775**	4
4	2.0423	PR strategies are determined and implemented by principals in individual schools.	2.2676*	5
7	1.1765	PR policy specifies PR strategies for implementation.	2.1471**	6
8	0.8451	PR strategies are developed by the PR director and a representative PR committee and approved for implementation by the superintendent.	2.1408**	7
6	1.2239	PR policy does not include a statement on PR strategies for implementation.	1.9254**	8
9	0.7302	PR strategies are stated as behavioral objectives within the PR policy.	1.5714**	9
10	0.5352	PR strategies are developed by a citizen's advisory committee for administrative and board action.	1.4366**	10

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 6. - A Ranked Comparison of "Is" and "Ought" Means for PR Policy Assessment Statements, Rank Ordered by "Ought" Means

IS Rank	IS Mean	Variable	OUGHT Mean	OUGHT Rank
3	1.0845	PR policy stipulates ongoing assessment.	3.1127**	1
4	1.0704	PR policy recommends periodic review.	2.9437**	2
2	1.1429	PR policy includes a statement on the need for assessment.	2.8571**	3
1	1.4000	PR policy specifies assessment by the superintendent.	2.8143**	4
5	1.0286	PR policy stipulates annual assessment.	2.6143**	5
6	1.0143	PR policy charges the PR director with determination of assessment procedures.	2.4714**	6
9	0.6000	PR policy specifies procedures for assessment.	2.3857**	7
8	0.7286	PR policy specifies periodic assessment by the board of education.	1.9143**	8
7	1.000	PR policy allows individual schools to determine their own assessment procedures.	1.7059**	9
10	0.2571	PR policy recommends a periodic assessment by outside consultants.	1.3143**	10

**Significant at .01 level.

Participants with a total of 14 items reveals 9 statements significant at the .01 level and 3 statements at the .05 level of significance. Values having a total of 23 statements reflects even stronger significance since all but three are significant at the .01 level of confidence. Goals, exceeding in significance the 2 previous policy aspects, has all of its 21 policy statements significant at the .01 confidence level. With 15 policy statements structure reveals all but three significant at the .01 confidence level. With 10 policy statements strategies indicates 6 at the .01 level and 4 at the .05 level. The last policy aspect, assessment, with its 10 policy statements, is completely significant at the .01 confidence level.

Further review, however, indicates that on a scale of 4 to 0, or always to never, only a few policy statements merit utmost consideration. (The 0-4 scale, used on the questionnaire for ease of interpretation by respondents, was later converted to a 1-5 scale to allow for missing data while computing. Still later, the means derived from the revised scale were reconverted to be consistent with the questionnaire scale.)

3.51 - 4.00 Always
2.51 - 3.50 Frequently
1.50 - 2.50 Occasionally
0.50 - 1.49 Rarely
0.00 - 0.49 Never

Using the preceding scale weights, it is immediately evident that only 26 variables stand out as important in PR policy development, those whose means range from 3.51 - 4.00. These "always" PR policy statements are as follows:

. PR policy is district wide. (participants) 3.7436**

. PR policy is written. (participants) 3.5584**

. The public must have confidence in its schools. (values) 3.9367**

. Community attitudes and expectations about their schools are important for boards and administrators to know. (values) 3.9359**

. Schools belong to the public. (values) 3.9241**

. Support is achieved through effective two-way communication systems between school and community. (values) 3.9241**

. The school is an integral part of the community. (values) 3.8816**

. Mutual trust between community and school is the foundation of any school PR program. (values) 3.8158**

. Open board meetings promote good school-press relations. (values) 3.7467**

. Keeping the press informed enhances school-community relations. (values) 3.6794**

. An open school climate is conducive to effective administrative, staff, student, and press relationships. (values) 3.6974**

. An informed staff is a productive one. (values) 3.5658**

. Schools promote good citizenship. (values) 3.5658**

. Teaching excellence is the best kind of PR. (values) 3.5195**

. To establish a two-way communication system between the school and its various publics. (goals) 3.8919**

. To develop a good working relationship with the media. (goals) 3.8533**

. To disseminate information to the school's publics. (goals) 3,8400**

. To eliminate rumor and misunderstanding. (goals) 3.8243**

. To disseminate information to certificated and noncertificated personnel. (goals) 3.8243**

. To interpret the school's curriculum to its publics. (goals) 3.7042**

. To report student achievement. (goals) 3.6933**

. To interpret board and administrative action. (goals) 3.6892**

. To improve communication between parents and teachers. (goals) 3.5139**

. To interpret the school budget to the school's various publics. (goals) 3.5070** (rounded to 3.51)

. The PR director reports directly to the superintendent. (structure) 3.9167**

. The school's public relations activities are carried out by both the central office and individual schools. (structure) 3.5070** (rounded to 3.51)

Tables 7-12, in ranking policy statements between trials by F-ratio, prove to be even more interesting in their implications for PR policy developers. An additional number of policy statements, for example, take on increasing importance by virtue of the large differences between certain IS and OUGHT policy statements in all policy aspects that the F-ratio tables make evident. By choosing only those statements which reflect these large differences, the researcher is able to identify other important PR policy statements that might have otherwise received only passing attention. Again, while those statements earlier classified as "always" ought to provide important directions in PR policy construction, these directions call for only increases in current efforts rather than substantial changes in PR policy formulation. While not discounting the importance of the former, it is essential that the latter be placed in proper perspective. The substantial changes, to which the F-ratio portends, may be precisely those that must receive greatest emphasis in improving the public's confidence in the schools; for they, while low in perceived importance as "ought" statements, rank high as promising directions.

Table 7. - PR Policy Participants Statements Between Trials Ranked by F-Ratio.

No.	Variable	F-Ratio
1.	PR Policy is determined by a representative committee comprised of board members, administrators, teachers, parents, students, and the public relations director.	118.023**
11.	The board has a standing public relations committee.	66.458**
5.	PR policy is developed with input from various community groups.	55.548**
12.	PR policy is developed by a citizen's advisory committee.	46.075**
10.	PR policy is written.	42.372**
4.	PR policy is developed by outside consultants and approved by the superintendent and the board.	26.341**
8.	PR policy is developed by the PR director and approved by the superintendent and the board.	14.993**
13.	PR policy is district wide.	12.179**
14.	PR policy is determined by individual building principals and approved by the superintendent and the board.	7.247**
7.	PR policy is written by the PR director.	3.943*
6.	PR policy is written by the superintendent.	1.796
3.	PR policy is determined by the superintendent and approved by the board.	1.539
9.	PR policy is determined by influential members of the community and approved by the board.	0.751
2.	PR policy is determined by board members.	0.129

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 8. - PR Policy Values Statements Between Trials Ranked by F-Ratio.

No.	Variable	F-Ratio
2.	Support is achieved through effective two-way communication systems between school and community.	52.373**
7.	Community attitudes and expectations about their schools are important for boards and administrators to know.	47.199**
17.	Mutual trust between community and school is the foundation of any school PR program.	46.091**
10.	Schools promote good citizenship.	45.968**
19.	An open school climate is conducive to effective administrative, staff, student, and parent relationship.	42.605**
4.	The public must have confidence in its schools.	42.299**
14.	Citizen participation imparts direction and meaning to the school program.	41.179**
18.	An informed staff is a productive one.	39.370**
11.	The school is an integral part of the community.	36.764**
12.	Change and innovations are vital to progress.	22.906**
16.	A well-developed school philosophy promotes the ideals of the community.	22.412**
21.	Education is meant to meet the needs of the various publics.	21.779**
3.	Schools belong to the public.	21.649**
23.	Open board meetings promote good school-press relations.	17.764**
8.	Teaching excellence is the best kind of PR.	16.186**
15.	Keeping the press informed enhances school-community relations.	14.202**

Table 8. (continued)

No.	Variable	F-Ratio
5.	An uninformed public is an unsupportive one.	12.985**
9.	The school is only as strong as the various publics who support it.	11.822**
6.	The ideals of the community must be promoted.	9.264**
22.	Leadership is a responsibility of boards and administrators.	9.154**
13.	Conflict promotes growth.	6.705*
20.	Professional educators need no assistance in running the schools.	6.292*
1.	Schools must be sold to the public.	4.660*

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 9. - PR Policy Goals Statements Between Trials Ranked by F-Ratio.

No.	Variable	F-Ratio
15.	To provide PR inservice for board members.	125.063**
14.	To provide PR inservice for teachers.	108.624**
16.	To provide PR inservice for administrators.	102.869**
3.	To survey community attitudes and expectations about the schools to guide board and administrative action.	58.149**
20.	To encourage active participation in local, state, and national educational conferences.	52.160**
13.	To develop face to face communication systems.	51.074**
11.	To encourage faculty participation in community affairs.	46.302**
18.	To interpret the school's curriculum to its various publics.	42.436**
19.	To interpret the school's extracurriculum program to its various publics.	40.029**
21.	To encourage professional development through formal study and workshops.	38.073**
1.	To establish a two-way communication system between the school and its various publics.	35.183**
12.	To improve communication between parents and teachers.	32.402**
17.	To interpret the school budget to the school's various publics.	31.080**
7.	To interpret board and administrative action.	28.219**
10.	To develop citizen's advisory committees.	26.713**
5.	To encourage citizen participation at board meetings.	23.465**

Table 9. (continued)

No.	Variable	F-Ratio
4.	To report student achievement.	21.959**
8.	To eliminate rumor and misunderstanding.	19.351**
6.	To develop a good working relationship with the media.	12.449**
2.	To disseminate information to the school's publics.	12.389**
21.	To disseminate information to certificated and noncertificated personnel.	11.785**

**Significant at .01 level.

Table 10. - PR Policy Structure Statements Between Trials Ranked by F-Ratio.

No.	Variable	F-Ratio
15.	The PR policy defines PR roles of board members, administrators, teachers, and other school personnel.	60.789**
9.	The PR policy is a series of goal statements.	54.786**
8.	The PR policy is a statement of school philosophy.	54.072**
7.	The role of the PR director is defined by policy.	52.766**
6.	PR policy is meticulously developed with plans and procedures spelled out.	45.686**
4.	The school's public relations activities are carried out by both the central office and individual schools.	22.526**
12.	PR policy is written as behavioral objectives.	20.166**
13.	PR policy is developed from a study of other school district PR policies.	18.614**
2.	Public relations activities are conducted only by central office personnel.	8.948**
10.	The PR policy is written in the form of a legal resolution.	7.802**
1.	The PR director reports directly to the superintendent.	7.094**
14.	PR policy is developed from a study of board minutes.	7.057**
5.	The PR policy is written in broad policy language.	5.802*
11.	The PR policy is developed to provide the superintendent with considerable discretion in determining how it is interpreted and implemented.	2.067
3.	School principals are responsible for carrying out their own PR programs.	0.156

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 11. -- PR Policy Strategies Statements Between Trials Ranked by F-Ratio.

No.	Variable	F-Ratio
5.	PR strategies are developed by the PR director and a representative PR committee and approved for implementation by the superintendent.	69.086**
9.	PR strategies are developed by a citizen's advisory committee for administrative and board action.	41.077**
8.	PR strategies are jointly determined and implemented by central office personnel and principals in individual schools.	31.162**
1.	PR policy specifies PR strategies for implementation.	27.523**
2.	PR strategies are stated as behavioral objectives within the PR policy.	26.476**
10.	PR policy does not include a statement on PR strategies for implementation.	10.562**
7.	PR strategies are determined and implemented by principals in individual schools.	4.640*
4.	PR strategies are determined by the PR director with implementation subject to the approval of the superintendent and the board.	4.179*
3.	PR strategies are determined and implemented by the PR director.	3.573
6.	PR strategies are developed by the PR director and approved for implementation by the superintendent.	1.483

*Significant at .05 level.
**Significant at .01 level.

Table 12. - PR Policy Assessment Statements Between Trials Ranked by F-Ratio.

No.	Variable	F-Ratio
3.	PR policy stipulates ongoing assessment.	131.098**
5.	PR policy recommends periodic review.	114.843**
2.	PR policy specifies procedures for assessment.	108.627**
1.	PR policy includes a statement on the need for assessment.	89.675**
6.	PR policy charges the PR director with the determination of assessment procedures.	67.750**
4.	PR policy stipulates annual assessment.	66.371**
10.	PR policy specifies assessment by the superintendent.	63.150**
9.	PR policy specifies periodic assessment by the board of education.	62.537**
8.	PR policy recommends a periodic assessment by outside consultants.	57.563**
7.	PR policy allows individual schools to determine their own assessment procedures.	18.590**

**Significant at .01 level.

A good example of the kind of direction the F-ratio tables offer is, among others, Variable 1, under the policy aspect participation. The OUGHT mean of Variable 1 suggests only frequent application; but its F-ratio earns it the top spot in participation. The prominence of Variable 1, as a recommended method of policy formulation, is also borne out in the present day literature of school public relations, as is the prominence of other variables to follow, many of which also owe their emergence to distinctions manifested by F-ratios.

Variable 1, then, is worthy of special consideration by PR policy makers.

. PR policy OUGHT TO BE determined by a representative committee comprised of board members, administrators, teachers, students, and the public relations director.

The distance in F-ratios between Variable 1 (118.023) and the next participation policy statement variable (66.458) puts Variable 1 in a distinct position of concern. Such breaks between F-ratios govern, as well, the proceeding selections, some of which, making their first appearance, can be added to the growing list of policy statements to be highlighted in PR policy development.

Under the aspect of values similar differences also merit attention, the first nine to be exact, after which a substantial break seems to occur between F-ratios (36.764 to 22.906). PR policy values highlighted here are as follows:

. Support is achieved through effective two-way communication systems between school and community.

. Community attitudes and expectations about their schools are important for boards and administrators to know.

. Mutual trust between community and school is the foundation of any school PR program.

. Schools promote good citizenship.

. An open school climate is conducive to effective administrative, staff, student, and parent relationships.

. The public must have confidence in its schools.

. Citizen participation imparts direction and meaning to the school program. (new policy statement)

. An informed staff is a productive one.

. The school is an integral part of the community.

Under the aspect of goals, three new statements also stand out, with F-ratios of 125.63, 108.624, and 102.869 and with an appreciable break occurring with the next variable, which has an F-ratio of 58.149.

. To provide PR inservice for board members.

. To provide PR inservice for teachers.

. To provide PR inservice for administrators.

With the aspect of structure four statements gain prominence before an appreciable break occurs (45.686 to 22.526), thereby minimizing the differences between IS and OUGHT statements. These statements, all appearing for the first time in the growing list of model PR policy statements, point to the following structural composition of PR policy formulation.

. The PR policy defines PR roles of board members, administrators, teachers, and other personnel.

. The PR policy is a series of goal statements.

. The PR policy is a statement of school philosophy.

. The role of the PR director is defined by policy.

. PR policy is meticulously developed with plans and procedures spelled out.

Under the aspect of strategies the most appreciable difference in F-ratios occurs between the first (69.086) and second (41.077) policy statement, thereby imparting importance to still another variable.

. PR strategies are developed by the PR director and a representative PR committee and approved for implementation by the superintendent.

There are also 3 statements under the aspect of assessment which appear for the first time. Here the first appreciable break occurs between the F-ratios 108.627 and 89.675. The statements deserving attention here are as follows:

. PR policy stipulates ongoing assessment.

. PR policy recommends periodic review.

. PR policy specifies procedures for assessment.

Expanded Analysis

Two further tests (2 and 3) were conducted to shed light on the importance of policy statements selected for inclusion in the study. Test 2 was run on three groups: (1) PR directors, whose school districts had written PR policies; (2) PR directors, whose school districts did not have written PR policies; and (3) PR directors, whose school districts were in the process of developing a PR policy. The breakdown was 46 written, 24 unwritten, and 3 being written, with 1 no response for an adjusted N of 73. Test 3 was run on 2 groups, at which time the "being written" policy group was lumped with the group that had no written policy. This breakdown was 46 written and 27 unwritten. The rationale used here was that "being written" did not necessarily imply any depth of policy development and therefore, should be viewed from still another perspective. Since part III of the questionnaire, as previously indicated, asked that PR directors submit a copy of their school's PR policy, it was possible to verify through policy submissions almost half of the entries made in the categories: written, unwritten, and being written. The result of this cross referencing produced only minor discrepancies. Thus the data received for this test was, for the most part, acceptable.

Test Two

In the computer program ANSCHEFF, if more than 2 groups are statistically tested, "a Scheffe's test is automatically performed for each pair of means involved, provided that F for the comparison in the analysis of variance is significant beyond the 0.10 level."[23] As a result of test 2 significant differences were reported on 9 policy statements. An IS statement, the first appeared under the aspect of participants.

. PR policy is written.

Here the significant difference was between groups 1 and 2 at the .01 confidence level, with an F-ratio of 18.9163 and with the mean of the first group (3.2174) almost twice the size of the second (1.2083). There were no significant differences evident between groups 1 and 3 and 2 and 3. Group 3 had a mean of 2.0000.

The second policy statement to show differences, also an IS statement, appeared under the aspect of values.

. Leadership is a responsibility of boards and administrators.

No significant difference was evident between groups 1 and 2, but between 1 and 3 and 2 and 3 significance was at the .01 and .05 confidence levels respectively. The F-ratio between groups 1 and 3 was 5.4897 and between groups 2 and 3, 3.6827. Respective means for groups 1, 2, and 3 were 3.3913, 3.1739, and 2.0000.

The third policy statement showing differences was the second translated into an OUGHT statement.

. Leadership OUGHT TO BE a responsibility of boards and administrators.

Here statistical differences were again not reflected between groups 1 and 2, but did appear, as earlier, between groups 1 and 3 and between groups 2 and 3 at the .01 confidence level. The F-ratios between groups 1 and 3 and between groups 2 and 3 were 10.9191 and 8.1254, respectively. Means for groups 1, 2, and

3 were 3.6591, 3.4348, and 1.6667, respectively.

The fourth policy statement where a difference became obvious was a structure policy IS statement.

. The PR policy is a statement of school philosophy.

Here a difference was evident only between groups 1 and 2 at the .01 confidence level, with the written policy group having a considerably higher mean (2.1591) than the unwritten policy group (0.9048). The F-ratio between the groups was 5.6923. Group 3 had a mean of 2.0000.

The fifth policy statement, an IS statement, was another policy structure statement.

. The PR policy is written in broad policy language.

There was a significant difference between groups 1 and 2 at the .01 confidence level, where an F-ratio of 41.0315 was noted and where group 1 had a mean (3.6444) more than twice the size of group 2 (1.2857). There was also a difference, significant at the .05 confidence level, between groups 1 and 3, where the F-ratio was 4.5357. Group 3 had a mean of 1.5000.

The sixth policy statement was also an IS structure statement.

. The PR policy is developed to provide the superintendent with considerable discretion in determining how it is interpreted and implemented.

The only difference, significant at the .01 confidence level, was between groups 1 and 2, with group 1 having a mean of 3.4565 and group 2, a mean of 1.7143. The F-ratio between groups 1 and 2 was 17.1523. Group 3 had a mean of 1.5000.

The seventh policy statement showing a difference was a structure OUGHT statement.

. School principals are responsible for carrying out their own PR programs.

A significant difference appeared between groups 1 and 2 at the .01 confidence level, with group 1 having a mean of 2.8864 and group 2, a mean of

1.7391. The F-ratio between the two groups was 8.3734. The mean for group 3 was 1.6667.

The eighth policy statement was the sixth statement repeated, this time as an OUGHT structure statement.

. The PR policy ought to be developed to provide the superintendent with considerable discretion in determining how it is interpreted and implemented.

The significant difference here was between groups 1 and 3 at the .05 confidence level, with group 1 again having the higher of the two means, 3.3111 and 1.6667, respectively. The F-ratio between the two groups was 3.7100. The mean for group 2 was 2.7273.

The ninth and last significant policy statement was an assessment IS statement.

. PR policy recommends a periodic assessment by outside consultants.

The significant difference here was between groups 1 and 3 at the .05 confidence level, where the F-ratio between the two groups was 3.2811 and where group 3 had the higher of the two means (1.0000 as opposed to 0.1111). Group 2 had a mean of 0.3182.

In summing up the results of Test 2, it is, perhaps, appropriate to point out that only 1 policy statement merits further consideration. It is an OUGHT statement, which addresses the PR role of school principals, significant at the .01 confidence level between groups 1 and 2, or those with and without a written PR policy. This statement reads: "School principals are responsible for carrying out their own PR programs." Because the purpose of the study is to target the OUGHT TO BE and not the IS in PR policy development, all significant IS policy statements are discarded for lack of relevance. Similarly, OUGHT differences which appear as a result of variance between groups other than 1 and 2 are discarded for this same lack of relevance. A summary of significant Test 2 results is reflected in Table 13.

Table 13. - A Summary of Results of Written (1), Unwritten (2), and Being Written (3)PR Policies by Policy Variable, Policy Aspect, Group Means, and F-Ratio

No.	Variable	Group Means 1	2	3	F-Ratio	Groups
10	Policy is written. (participants)	3.2174	1.2083	2.000	18.9163**	(1-2)
22	Leadership is a responsibility of boards and administrators. (values)	3.3913	3.1739	2.000	5.4897** 3.6827*	(1-3) (2-3)
45	Leadership is (OUGHT) a responsibility of boards and administrators (values)	3.6591	3.4348	1.6667	10.9191** 8.1254**	(1-3) (2-3)
8	The PR policy is a statement of school philosophy (structure)	2.1591	0.9048	2.0000	5.6923**	(1-2)
5	The PR policy is written in broad policy language (structure)	3.6444	1.2857	1.5000	41.0315** 4.5357*	(1-2) (1-3)
11	The PR policy is developed to provide the superintendent with considerable discretion in determining how it is interpreted and implemented (structure)	3.4565	1.7143	1.5000	17.1523**	(1-2)
18	School principals are responsible for carrying out their own PR programs (structure)	2.8864	1.7391	1.6667	8.3734**	(1-2)
26	The PR policy is developed to provide the superintendent with considerable discretion in determining how it is interpreted and implemented (structure)	3.3111	2.7273	1.6667	3.7100*	(1-3)
8	PR policy recommends a periodic assessment by outside consultants (assessment)	0.1111	0.3182	1.0000	3.2811*	(1-3)

*Significant at .05 Level.
**Significant at .01 Level.

Test Three

The third statistical test revealed 21 significant differences between the reconstructed two groups: (1) 46 with a written policy and (2) 27 without a written policy. However, despite their significant differences, not all policy statements are carried forward for inclusion in model PR policy development. From Test 3 only those OUGHT statements significant at the .01 confidence level will receive further attention. Justification lies in the inclusion of only those statements deemed most relevant for OUGHT policy development. There is also justification for discarding significant IS statements regardless of their confidence levels; for while they most assuredly contribute to an understanding of policy development as it presently exists, they offer no glimmer as to how it ought to be. Because of such refinement only two statements are brought forward for final policy development consideration. A third, Variable 18, under the aspect of assessment, while significant at the .01 confidence level, is judged to be a nondirection, the direction having come from group 2 (without a written policy) rather than group 1 (with a written policy). The remaining two OUGHT statements, the first new and the second evident as a result Test 2, are as follows:

. The PR policy is developed to provide the superintendent with considerable discretion in determining how it is interpreted and implemented. (structure)

. School principals are responsible for carrying out their own PR programs. (structure)

Table 13 displays a summary of the significant policy statements derived from the Test 3 analysis.

Table 14. - A summary of Results of Written (1) and Unwritten (2) PR Policies by Policy Variable, Policy Aspect, Group Means, and F-Ratio

No.	Variable	Group Means 1	2	F-Ratio
13	PR policy is district wide. (participants)	3.5652	2.9639	4.551*
9	The school is only as strong as the various publics who support it. (values)	3.2667	2.8889	5.878*
20	Professional educators need no assistance in running the schools. (values)	2.3478	1.9231	4.359*
26	Schools (OUGHT) belong to the public. (values)	3.9778	3.8148	4.447*
38	Keeping the press informed (OUGHT) enhances school communiy relations. (values)	3.5909	3.8519	4.356*
39	A well developed school philosophy (OUGHT) promotes the ideals of the community. (values)	3.3810	3.7037	4.874*
45	Leadership is (OUGHT) a responsibility of boards and administrators. (values)	3.6591	3.2308	4.797*
11	To encourage faculty participation in community affairs. (goals)	1.9778	2.5600	3.894*
31	(OUGHT) To develop citizen's advisory committees. (goals)	2.9545	3.4231	4.337*
32	(OUGHT) To encourage faculty participation in community affairs. (goals)	2.7727	3.3077	4.873*
3	School principals are responsible for carrying out their own PR programs. (structure)	2.6304	2.0385	4.988*

Table 14. - A Summary of Results of Written (1) and Unwritten (2) PR Policies by Policy Variable, Policy Aspect, Group Means, and F-Ratio
(continued from page 39)

No.	Variable	Group Means 1	2	F-Ratio
5	The PR policy is written in broad policy language. (structure)	3.6444	1.3043	87.068**
8	The PR policy is a statement of school philosophy.	2.1591	1.0417	9.781**
11	The PR policy is developed to provide the superintendent with considerable discretion in determining how it is interpreted and implemented.	3.4565	1.6957	37.794**
18	School principals are (OUGHT) responsible for carrying out their own PR programs. (structure)	2.8864	1.7308	18.656**
20	The PR policy is (OUGHT) written in broad policy language. (structure)	3.5217	2.9200	4.634*
26	The PR policy is (OUGHT) developed to provide the superintendent with considerable discretion in determining how it is interpreted and implemented. (structure)	3.3111	2.6000	7.714**
17	PR strategies are (OUGHT) determined and implemented by principals in individual schools. (strategies)	2.4773	1.8889	5.019*
6	PR policy charges the PR director with the determination of assessment procedures.(assessment)	0.7778	1.4583	3.990*
8	PR policy recommends a periodic assessment by outside consultants.(assessment)	0.1111	0.3750	4.545*
18	PR policy (OUGHT) recommends a periodic assessment by outside consultants.(assessment)	0.9545	1.7308	7.198**

* Significant at .05 level.
** Significant at .01 level.

A Final Assessment

In retrospect, Test 1 helped to identify 40 PR policy statements that OUGHT to be of importance to PR policy makers. Test 2 added another PR policy statement to this list, and Test 3, still another. Test 3 also presented a problem which must be resolved before final recommendations can be made.

PR directors in school districts with written policies indicate, on the one hand, that policies OUGHT to be developed to provide the superintendent with considerable discretion in determining how it is interpreted and implemented. On the other, they seem to identify specific goals which OUGHT to be addressed in a PR policy. In the same vein, the high F-ratio of the statement, "PR policy is meticulously developed with plans and procedures spelled out," seems to indicate that a shift of perspective might be beneficial, especially when the outcome of present PR policy development is measured against an erosion of public confidence in the schools. A compromise would undoubtedly be a combination of the two statements. Such a compromise would assure greater policy guidance for PR directors, along with reasonable discretionary privileges for the chief school administrator.

The meticulous development of plans and procedures may limit discretion and, to some extent, sacrifice flexibility for direction and continuity, but it does not completely rule it out. Discretionary interpretation and implementation is, in fact, always possible so long as policy guidelines are not spelled out behaviorally. The statement, therefore, is rewritten to read: PR policy is developed with plans and procedures spelled out, while simultaneously providing the superintendent with sufficient discretion for policy interpretation and implementation.

In formulating a model PR policy, policy developers should, then, give special attention to the following statements. (Statements here are ordered as they appear on the questionnaire.)

. PR policy is determined by a representative committee comprised of board members, administrators, teachers, parents, students, and the public relations director. (participants)

. PR policy is written. (participants)

. PR policy is district wide. (participants)

. Support is achieved through effective two-way communication systems between school and community. (values)

. Schools belong to the public. (values)

. The public must have confidence in its schools. (values)

. Community attitudes and expectations about their schools are important for boards and administrators to know. (values)

. Teaching excellence is the best kind of PR. (values)

. Schools promote good citizenship. (values)

. The school is an integral part of the community. (values)

. Citizen participation imparts direction and meaning to the school program. (values)

. Keeping the press informed enhances school-community relations. (values)

. Mutual trust between community and school is the foundation of any school PR program. (values)

. An informed staff is a productive one. (values)

. An open school climate is conducive to effective administrative, staff, student, and parent relationships. (values)

. Open board meetings promote good school-press relations. (values)

. To establish a two-way communication system between the school and its various publics. (goals)

. To disseminate information to the school's publics. (goals)

. To report student achievement. (goals)

. To develop a good working relationship with the media. (goals)

. To interpret board and administrative action. (goals)

. To eliminate rumor and misunderstanding. (goals)

. To disseminate information to certificated and noncertificated personnel. (goals)

. To improve communication between parents and teachers. (goals)

. To provide PR inservice for teachers. (goals)

. To provide PR inservice for board members. (goals)

. To provide PR inservice for administrators. (goals)

. To interpret the school's curriculum to its publics. (goals)

. To interpret the school budget to the school's various publics. (goals)

. The PR director reports directly to the superintendent. (structure)

. School principals are responsible for carrying out their own PR programs. (structure)

. The school's public relations activities are carried out by both the central office and individual schools. (structure)

. PR policy is developed with plans and procedures spelled out, while simultaneously providing the superintendent with sufficient discretion for policy interpretation and implementation. (combined statement) (structure)

. The role of the PR director is defined by policy. (structure)

. The PR policy is a statement of school philosophy. (structure)

. The PR policy is a series of goal statements. (structure)

. The PR policy defines PR roles of board members, administrators, teachers, and other school personnel. (structure)

. PR strategies are developed by the PR director and representative PR committee and approved for implementation by the superintendent. (strategies)

. PR policy specifies procedures for assessment. (assessment)

. PR policy stipulates ongoing assessment. (assessment)

. PR policy recommends periodic review. (assessment)

Such a model PR policy might, in fact, be structured as follows:

The Board of Education of the Oakpark Public School System believes that the public must have confidence in its schools and that mutual trust between community and school is essential. Community attitudes and expectations are, therefore, important for boards and administrators to know, for support is achieved through effective two-way communication systems between school and community. Citizen participation imparts direction and meaning to the school program, and keeping the press (media) informed enhances school-community relations, as is an informed staff, a productive one. An open school climate is conducive to effective administrative, staff, student, and parent relationships, and open board meetings further enhance good school-press (media) relations.

Given these values, the Oakpark Board sets the following goals to accomplish:

1. To establish a two-way communication system between the school and its various publics (a) to interpret board and administrative action, (b) to eliminate rumor and misunderstanding and (c) to develop a good working relationship with the media;
2. To disseminate information to certificated and noncertificated personnel;
3. To provide inservice in school public relations to teachers, administrators, and board members; and
4. To interpret the school's curriculum, along with its budget, to the school's publics, and to report student achievement.

To accomplish these goals, the Oakpark School Board authorizes the employment of a full-time school public relations director, whose responsibility is to see that the school district's public relations activities are carried out by both the central office and individual schools, in which school principals are charged with the responsibility of carrying out their own PR activities with the aid of the school

public relations director.

To assist the school public relations director, a school public relations committee will be created by the board, which consists of board members, administrators, staff, students, and parents. This committee, under the direction of the school public relations director, will develop strategies to attain district wide school public relations goals and specific procedures for an ongoing assessment of the school district's public relations program. The school public relations director reports directly to the superintendent of schools.

A PR program begins with a well-developed PR policy and continues as long as there is rigorous adherence to and respect for the basic tenets of this policy. Policy is people working together shaping their destiny. School PR policy is the lamp that brightens their way.

Footnotes

1. American Association of School Administrators. The School Administrator, 36 (Feb. 1979), 3.

2. American Association of School Administrators. The School Administrator, 36 (May 1979), 3.

3. Ibid.

4. 1977-1978 NSPRA Membership Directory, Arlington, Va.: p. 84

5. Ibid., p. 70

6. Doyle M. Bortner. Public Relations for Public Schools (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing, 1972) p. 33.

7. Gordon McCloskey. Education and Public Understanding. 2nd ed.(New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 38.

8. Frank Moyer. Public Relations for School Personnel. (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing, 1974), p. 5.

9. Charles F. Faher. A Manual for School Board Members (A Cooperative Publication of The Center for Professional Development and The Kentucky School Boards Association). College of Education, University of Kentucky, Nov. 1976, p. 19.

10. Bortner, p. 49.

11. Leslie W. Kindred, Don Bagin and Donald R. Gallagher, The School And Community Relations (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976), pp. 30-32.

12. Bortner, p. 29.

13. John Thomas Thompson. Policymaking in American Public Education: A Framework for Analysis. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976), p. 18.

14. Ibid, p. 20.

15. Ibid, p. 45.

16. Ibid, p. 44.

17. Ibid, P. 20.

18. Philip Monypenny, "A Political Analysis of Structures for Educational Policy Making" Government of Public Education for Adequate Policy Making, eds. William P. McLure and Van Miller (Urbana, Illinois: Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1960), p. 1.

19. Dale Mann. Policy Decision-Making in Education: An Introduction to Calculation and Control (New York: Teachers College Press, 1975), p. 18.

20. Don Bagin, Frank Grazian and Charles Hanson. PR for School Board Members, VIII (Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators, 1976), p. 9.

21. Kindred, Bagin and Gallagher, p. 34.

22. Donald G. Barker. "Groups-By-Trials Analysis of Variance with Scheffe's Test," Educational And Psychological Measurement, 33, (1973), p. 743.

23. Ibid.